

Serial No. 10/069,831

Filed: February 26, 2002

RCE and Response to Office Action mailed December 27, 2005

**REMARKS**

Claims 27-34 and 36-47 are pending in the present application. Claims 27-30, 33, 34, 37, 38, and 42 have been amended to further describe that which was already claimed and/or maintain antecedent basis, Claim 35 has been canceled, and Claims 43-47 have been added to claim additional subject matter described in the specification. No new matter has been added. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of Claims 27-34 and 36-47 in view of the following remarks.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC §103(a)**

Claims 27-42 were rejected in a final office action mailed December 27, 2006 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,694,350 to Kurashima et al. (hereafter "Kurashima") and U.S. Patent No. 6,446,043 to Matsumoto et al. (hereafter "Matsumoto"). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections since the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, fails to describe each and every limitation of Amended Claims 27-34 and 36-42 thus a prima facie case of obviousness cannot be maintained.

For example, in amended Claim 27, the method describes a server extracting from a plurality of communication parameters, each of which is stored in association with a telephone number, communication parameters stored in association with the notified telephone number that include individual user specific identification information of a user of the mobile phone and communication software configuration values. Neither Kurashima nor Matsumoto alone or in combination teach, suggest, or disclose such communication parameters. To the contrary, Kurashima describes extraction and transmission of a list of communication servers and a list of

Serial No. 10/069,831

Filed: February 26, 2002

RCE and Response to Office Action mailed December 27, 2005

services (Col. 13, lines 28-31), and Matsumoto describes extraction of directory names, communication parameters, and/or schedules of other users (Col. 7 lines 21-37, Col. 8 lines 8-11). The method of Claim 33 describes notifying the server of an identifier of the communication software stored on the communication terminal and an identifier allotted to the communication device. None of the cited prior art describes or is concerned with notification to a server of an identifier of communication software stored in a communication terminal.

In another example, Claim 35 describes a server that includes an extracting unit configured to extract from a storing unit a first communication parameter corresponding to the telephone number received by the receiving unit, and a second communication parameter corresponding to the software identifier received by a receiving unit. None of the cited prior art teaches, suggests, or discloses extraction of a communication parameter corresponding to a telephone number and extraction of a communication parameter corresponding to a software identifier as described in Claim 34. Claim 42 describes a server that includes a storing unit operable to store a plurality of combinations of a communication parameter and an identifier of communication software included in a communication device. None of the cited prior art, either alone or in combination teaches, suggests, or discloses combinations of a communication parameter and an identifier of communication software included in a communication device.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 27, 33, 34 and 42 and the claims dependent therefrom since all of the described limitations are not taught, suggested, or disclosed by the cited prior art, either alone or in combination, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness is no longer supportable. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of Claims 27-42.


Serial No. 10/069,831

Filed: February 26, 2002

RCE and Response to Office Action mailed December 27, 2005

Also, none of the cited prior art teaches, suggests, or discloses the limitations described in new Claims 43-47. Accordingly, the presently pending claims of this application are allowable over the cited prior art, and Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to so find and issue a Notice of Allowance for this application. Should the Examiner deem a telephone conference to be beneficial in expediting allowance/examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Sanders N. Hillis  
Attorney for Applicant  
Attorney Reg. No. 45,712

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE  
CUSTOMER NO. 00757  
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204  
Telephone: 317-636-0886  
Facsimile: 317-634-6701